



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,691	10/24/2003	Takaya Matsuishi	244421US2	6629

22850 7590 02/07/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/691,691	MATSUISHI, TAKAYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amelia Rutledge	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/22/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application, filed 10/24/2003.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 16, 25, and 26 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-12, 14, 17-22, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moshfeghi, U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833, issued November 2002.**

Independent claim 1 cites: *A display data creating apparatus that creates display data representing a plurality of display sections, each of the display sections containing a prescribed type of information, in response to a request from a client apparatus supplied via a network, and transmits the display data to the client apparatus via the network, the display data creating apparatus comprising:*

a determination part that determines for at least one of the display sections whether the information to be contained in a current display section satisfies a prescribed condition; and

Moshfeghi teaches a method of controlling internet browser functionality and display according to user access and authorization levels (Abstract), in response to a client request, with database and browser interface which determines for each display section whether the information to be contained in the display satisfies the user's access permissions (Col. 12, l. 49-Col. 13, l. 37, and Col. 13, l. 39-52). Each section of the browser page contains a prescribed type of information, according to access rules.

a display data creating part that updates the current display section in accordance with the determination result to create the display data.

Moshfeghi teaches that the browser display is updated in accordance with the determination result to create and focus on the relevant data (Col. 14, l. 15-50).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Moshfeghi teaches embedded browser functionality to determine whether the authorization conditions are satisfied (Col. 12, l. 49-Col. 13, l. 37).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Moshfeghi teaches that the prescribed condition varies for each of the display sections (Col. 13, l. 53-Col. 14, l. 14).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Moshfeghi teaches a "crawler" program to update information contained in the display (Col. 14, l. 32-40).

Regarding dependent claims 5-8, Moshfeghi teaches that display sections are emphasized according to user profile records, i.e., by creating a browser sub-window

including specific controls and markup language documents (Col. 21-22, Claim 1, especially (ii)). Further it is inherent in Moshfeghi's disclosure that the display data layout could be modified to expand a particular display section or to position it above other display sections, because Moshfeghi discloses that the display of controls and data can be resized, rearranged, temporarily hidden, overlapped, minimized, maximized, as windowing layouts well known in the art (Col. 12, l. 18-29).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Moshfeghi teaches an updatable homepage for restricted users where the configuration of each display section is managed dynamically (Col. 14, l. 15-55). Moshfeghi teaches a "crawler" program to update information contained in the display (Col. 14, l. 32-40).

Regarding dependent claims 10 and 11, Moshfeghi teaches that the display configuration data of the display sections includes the information about the determination function. because each of the sub-windows are configured according to the directions in the user profile records (Col. 13, l. 21-35).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Moshfeghi teaches means for acquiring user profile and authentication information used for determining the display and layout for each display section (Col. 12, l. 60-Col. 13, l. 5).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Moshfeghi teaches using information stored in a database connected on the network (Col. 7, l. 39-Col. 8, l. 57) to determine user profile information. It is inherent in the disclosure of Moshfeghi that the display sections are updated when it is determined that the database has been updated, because the

user home page, for example, is created and continuously updated using dynamic programming techniques.

Regarding independent claim 15, claim 15 reflects the display data transmission system used to implement the display data creating apparatus as claimed in independent claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Independent claim 16 cites: *A method for transmitting display data comprised of a plurality of display sections, each display section containing a prescribed type of information, to a client apparatus, comprising the steps of:*

upon receiving a request from the client apparatus, determining for at least one of the display sections whether information to be contained in a current display section satisfies a prescribed condition;

creating the display data by updating the current display section in accordance with the determination result; and transmitting the created display data to the client apparatus via a network.

Moshfeghi teaches a method of controlling internet browser functionality and display according to user access and authorization levels (Abstract), in response to a client request, with database and browser interface which determines for each display section of the web page whether the information to be contained in the display satisfies the user's access permissions (Col. 12, l. 49-Col. 13, l. 37, and Col. 13, l. 39-52). Each section of the browser page contains a prescribed type of information, according to determination of user access rules. Moshfeghi teaches that the browser display sub-

Art Unit: 2176

windows are updated in accordance with the determination result to create and focus on the relevant data (Col. 14, l. 15-50).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Moshfeghi teaches that a system administrator would set the conditions for user access to each display section, the conditions being different for each display section and user (Col. 8, l. 9-34).

Regarding dependent claim 18, Moshfeghi teaches a "crawler" program to update information contained in the display (Col. 14, l. 32-40). Moshfeghi teaches embedded browser functionality to determine whether the authorization conditions are satisfied (Col. 12, l. 49-Col. 13, l. 37).

Regarding dependent claims 19-24, claims 19-24 reflect the methods used for the display data creating apparatus as claimed in dependent claims 5-8, 13, and 14, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 25, claim 25 reflects the machine readable program executed by a display data creating apparatus used to implement the methods as claimed in independent claim 16, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 26, claim 26 reflects the recording medium storing a machine readable program executed by a display data creating apparatus used to implement the methods as claimed in independent claim 16, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moshfeghi as applied to claims 1-12, 14, 17-22, and 24-26 above, and further in view of O’Kane, Jr. et al. (hereinafter “O’Kane”), U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0029504, published October 2001.**

Regarding dependent claim 13, while Moshfeghi does not explicitly teach displaying information representing the condition of equipment connected on the network; determining whether malfunction has occurred in the equipment; and indicating the occurrence of malfunction, O’Kane teaches a system for maintaining, updating, repairing, and monitoring remotely located communication equipment sites (Abstract), where equipment status is displayed via the network. O’Kane teaches determining equipment malfunction and displaying the malfunction occurrence (p. 4, par. 58; p. 5, par. 63; p. 6, Claim 1). Both Moshfeghi and O’Kane are analogous art because both are directed toward systems with processing rules to determine display data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply O’Kane to Moshfeghi, so that Moshfeghi would have the benefit of a system differentiating user profiles (Moshfeghi) which would provide automated site management to match a work request with a technician or worker having the appropriate skills (O’Kane, p. 1, par. 8)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 23, claim 23 reflects the methods used for the display data creating apparatus as claimed in dependent claim 13, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lemmons et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,442,755 issued August 2002

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISING PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100